UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
27th meeting
held on
Monday, 9 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. SUH (Vice-Chairman)	(Republic of Korea)
later:	Mr. ELARABY (Chairman)	(Egypt)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.27
4 December 1992

ENGLISH

92-61786 2676V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 TO 65, 68 AND 142; 67 AND 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who will speak on behalf of the European Community and its member States.

Sir MICHAEL WESTON (United Kingdom): The European Community and its member States welcome the successful conclusion of the long-running negotiations on the chemical weapons Convention at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on 3 September this year. The Convention bears testimony to the hard, intensive and thorough work carried out by the Conference on Disarmament and represents a historic achievement in the field of arms control and disarmament. The participation of over 80 countries in the elaboration of the Convention has resulted in an agreement which is balanced and equitable and represents a truly global perspective.

The chemical weapons Convention will not only ban chemical weapons and ensure the destruction of declared stocks, but will explore new ground in global arms control through the introduction of an unprecedented verification regime allowing on-site inspections by a new international organization of any facility suspected of non-compliance. The regime has been carefully constructed to deter potential evaders of the Convention's provisions, while allowing States to protect their legitimate interests.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

It will be backed up by monitoring of those chemicals and chemical facilities considered to be a potential threat to the Convention. These provisions will strengthen the Convention by enhancing confidence in its observance and will foster greater regional and global cooperation for mutual security. The rights of all States parties to benefit from international advances in chemical technology can only be enhanced in such an environment.

We welcome the clear and unequivocal global ban contained in the Convention on all forms of chemical weapons and the unconditional prohibition of their use against anyone. This should ensure that the Convention will be an effective defence not only against existing types of weapons, but also against any chemical weapon which technological changes of the future may make possible. The Convention also provides for assistance and protection to be given to any State party threatened by chemical weapons. This will be a further deterrent against the use of chemical weapons against a State party and is another illustration of the equitable nature of the Treaty.

The Community and its member States believe that the chemical weapons Convention, which represents the broad-based consensus of the Conference on Disarmament, will make a substantial contribution to international peace and security. It has to be considered on its own merits and its signature should not be dependent on preconditions, in particular because the Convention constitutes a meaningful contribution to the establishment of zones free of weapons of mass destruction. It represents a welcome step in addressing regional security concerns. We hope that it will encourage Governments to move towards further and more far-reaching disarmament measures by creating conditions in which all States may feel more secure. We hope also that the

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

unprecedented system of verification contained in the Convention could become a reference for other multilateral disarmament agreements or for the strengthening of existing verification regimes.

We would like to pay a tribute to the many active participants in the negotiations from all regions. Community members have played their part in our common endeavour. We are particularly honoured that the task of chairing the final negotiating session at the Conference on Disarmament should have fallen to a representative of a Community member State.

We look forward to the Convention receiving a clear endorsement in the Committee and urge all States who have not already done so to join in sponsoring and supporting draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.1. We reaffirm our intention to be original signatories to the Convention next January, and to promote actively its early entry into force, and we urge all nations to do likewise. The Community and its member States are committed to ensuring the efficient and cost-effective implementation of the Convention, thereby enhancing cooperative multilateralism as a basis for international peace and security.

To introduce the views of the European Community and its member States on the subject of regional disarmament, I can do no better than to repeat again what we have said before: we believe that the adoption of regional arms control and disarmament measures is one of the most effective ways for States to contribute to the general arms control and disarmament process.

The changes which have taken place in the international situation over the last year have highlighted the importance of the role that regional agreements can and should play in the promotion of international peace and

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

security. In my general statement to the Committee on behalf of the Community and its member States, I referred to the hatreds and fears which have resurfaced in the former Yugoslavia, and confirmed our full support for the efforts being made in partnership between the United Nations and the European Community to bring peace to that region. I mentioned also the emergence of 15 new States where a year ago there was one, the Soviet Union. The new problems and challenges that entails might also benefit from regional efforts.

We do, of course, welcome the moves towards greater political and military stability and cooperation in our own region. We believe that the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), which limits holdings of major items of land and air equipment and contains sweeping provisions for verification measures, together with the recent extension to the Treaty, commonly knowns as CFE 1A, which limits the number of military personnel deployed by each State, will be a key element in European security. While the CFE Treaty was negotiated among States belonging to two military alliances, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), and the then Warsaw Pact, the CFE 1A agreement was reached in a radically new political situation in Europe. So, whilst complementary in nature, these agreements also reflect the changing political landscape of the region.

The Vienna Document of 1992, which came into force on 1 May, marks a significant step forward in the field of confidence- and security-building measures in the region, developing earlier measures including visits and also notification and observation of exercises, and introducing additional restrictions on military activity together with new provisions for information exchange.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) remains an essential element in the new European security architecture, providing inter alia a valuable forum for dialogue on arms control and confidence-building measures. The Helsinki summit meeting, which took place in July this year, took this a stage further, with the decision to establish a CSCE forum for security coooperation to start a new negotiation on arms control, disarmament and confidence- and security-building, with the participation of all CSCE States, to enhance regular consultation and to intensify cooperation among the participating States on matters related to security and to further the process of reducing the risk of conflict.

We also believe that the Treaty on Open Skies, which was signed in March, will make a major contribution to confidence-building and stability throughout the CSCE area and beyond.

We hope that such achievements in the European context might offer some guidance and even possible model instruments for the solution of similar problems in other regions.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

In putting forward draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29, "Confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe", the member States of the Community welcome these practical achievements in the European arena over the past year and invite all States to consider ways of reducing the risk of confrontation and of strengthening security, taking due account of their specific regional conditions. We hope that this draft resolution will be adopted by consensus.

As we have said before, the European model is not necessarily one that can be applied to other regions. We are conscious of the fact that the various regions in the world have their own particular characteristics. Individual States have security interests of their own, often reflecting the prevailing circumstances in their respective regions. It was for this reason that, in the Working Paper the Community submitted to the United Nations Disarmament Commission in 1991, we stressed the importance of taking into account regional characteristics and stability, as well as highlighting the principles of sovereign equality for States, and of the peaceful settlement of disputes. As we stated in our paper,

> "Initiatives should take into account particular characteristics of each region and should lead to stability and security for all the participating States. The States in the region should themselves define appropriate and specific conditions for the security of their region, as well as conditions for ensuring their security in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations and generally recognized principles of international law." (A/CN.10/154, para. 2.2)

We are pleased to note that discussions at the United Nations Disarmament Commission have developed in such a way that commonly agreed guidelines and

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

principles on regional disarmament may now be within reach. These could then be drawn on freely by States anywhere when they wish to embark on a process towards enhanced security and stability in their region.

We highlighted last year how the events in the Gulf region had underlined the importance of regional arms control and disarmament and justified the search for a balanced and comprehensive control of armaments in the region, notably through a dialogue among the States of that region. We have, of course, not forgotten the Gulf crisis and its consequences, which can still be felt, not least through the continuing suffering of the Iraqi people under a brutal dictatorship. We congratulate the United Nations Special Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency for their work in implementing Security Council resolution 687 (1991), which has gone a long way towards reassuring the international community that Iraq will never again threaten its neighbours. However, there is more work to be done, and we welcome the provision in resolution 687 (1991) on the objective of establishing in the Middle East a zone free from weapons of mass destruction and all missiles capable of delivering them.

We continue to consider the Middle East to be an area where regional arms control and disarmament measures must be instituted as a matter of priority. We welcome the convening of an international peace conference on the Middle East. We believe that a successful outcome to the peace process is a vital element in the establishment of regional stability and confidence, and that it will pave the way for the realization of the goal of a Middle East free of all weapons of mass destruction. We reiterate our support for the process. The Community and its member States will continue to contribute fully to the multilateral Working Group on Arms Control and Regional Security.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The Middle East peace process is an example of the interaction of global and regional efforts to ensure security in a particular region. We hope that the Convention on chemical weapons, the text of which was agreed at the Conference on Disarmament this year, will also represent a welcome step in addressing regional security concerns and thus contribute to the conclusion of regional arms control and disarmament measures.

In my general statement to this Committee, I have already mentioned various regional initiatives, which we welcome. Among these are the North-South Joint Declaration of the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, which we believe should be fully implemented as soon as possible; the moves towards implementing the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa; and the steps taken by Argentina, Brazil and Chile towards bringing the Treaty of Tlatelolco into force for themselves. We welcome also major and positive initiatives in Latin America, such as the Mendoza Accord and the Cartagena Declaration. Other welcome steps not specifically concerned with disarmament, but taken with the same aim of improving regional stability and security, include the accords designed to bring peace and democracy to Mozambique and the multi-party elections in Angola. However, we deplore the outbreak of violence since those elections. We call on all parties to abide by Security Council resolution 785 (1992) adopted on 30 October. The only hope for peace in Angola is for both sides to refrain from violence and to continue to implement the peace agreements embodied in the Bicesse Accords.

The Community and its member States share the view that armed aggression is not an appropriate means to solve disputes between and within States. Regional arms control and disarmament is a vital part of solutions to regional conflicts and is essential if progress towards global security is to be

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

achieved. Solutions should be sought in a cooperative approach, preferably within a region, although sometimes the necessary steps may be stimulated from outside the region, if appropriate. But no one from either ouside or inside a region should try to impose a solution on others. Security perceptions are usually felt much more keenly at a regional level, but regional arms control and disarmament efforts cannot stand on their own. There must also be a serious political engagement to address the issues that produce tension and dispute. Furthermore, global and regional arms control and disarmament efforts should reinforce each other.

The adoption by consensus of resolution 46/36 F on regional disarmament during the forty-sixth session of the United Nations General Assembly illustrated the general resolve to stress the importance and to expand international awareness of regional disarmament. By co-sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25, being put forward this year by Peru, the member States of the Community wish to reaffirm their commitment to this cause. The draft resolution encourages all States to envisage the creation of regional mechanisms or institutions designed for the prevention and peaceful settlement of disputes, with the assistance, if requested, of the United Nations.

Whenever possible, the Community and its member States will continue to stimulate and support initiatives that lead to increased security in a region. We are convinced that the search for regional stability must be pursued in order to enhance security at the lowest possible level of military forces, curbing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and promoting economic and social progress.

On behalf of the European Community and its member States, I should like also to make some comments on the issue of conventional disarmament.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

In recent times the process of nuclear disarmament has gathered momentum, not only with the Treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles (INF) and the Treaty on the Reduction and Limititation of Strategic Offensive Arms (START), but also by the subsequent agreements between the United States and Russia, including the far-reaching reductions in strategic arms announced by President Bush and President Yeltsin in June 1992.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

Conventional disarmament too has seen major progress through the signing of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe - the CFE Treaty - in Paris in November 1990. This Treaty has been provisionally applied since 17 July 1992 and formally enters into force today. The process of conventional-arms control and disarmament in Europe is continuing. A further agreement, commonly known as CFE-1A, on limits to manpower levels was signed on 10 July. A CSCE Forum for Security Cooperation has now been established in Vienna. This Forum has been tasked with starting new negotiations on arms control, disarmament and confidence- and security-building, with the participation of all CSCE States; enhancing regular consultation and intensifying cooperation between the participating States on matters related to security; and furthering the process of reducing the risk of conflict.

The increasing attention being given to conventional-arms control and disarmament is to be welcomed. Since the Second World War conventional weapons have caused an enormous number of casualties. But it is not simply the high number of casualties that should induce States to embark on a process of conventional disarmament. The Gulf War showed that the international community does not accept the use of armed aggression to solve disputes. Acquiring vast arsenals of conventional weapons in quantities that clearly go beyond the needs of defence and exerting efforts to acquire weapons of mass destruction simply do not pay and will eventually lead to disaster.

States should base their defence policies on military capability sufficient for individual or collective self-defence. They should strive to reduce the risks of conflict. They should not resort to the threat or use of force to settle differences. The principle of the peaceful settlement of

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

disputes should be fully respected and implemented in accordance with the United Nations Charter.

The Community and its member States have always attached great importance to the issue of conventional disarmament, as did the General Assembly in the Final Document of its tenth special session. We have, on a number of occasions in the past, elaborated on the necessity to embark on arms-control and disarmament measures in the conventional field. The European model may not be one for all regions to follow in all its aspects, but it is precisely because we are only too aware of the difficulties of engaging in a process of conventional-arms control and disarmament that we cannot but urge others to begin without delay.

The European example shows that conventional disarmament cannot be seen in isolation. Breakthroughs and progress occur when political circumstances allow for such potential developments. The political will to develop and adopt confidence-building measures can pave the way for arms-control and disarmament measures. Openness and transparency are an essential step in the creation of a climate of confidence and should therefore be the first priority. States should concentrate their efforts first on establishing stability by eliminating, in particular, the capability to launch surprise attacks and large-scale offensive operations. The objective of conventional-disarmament measures should be increased security at the lowest possible level of armaments and military forces consistent with the legitimate requirements of conflict prevention and management and of defence.

Increasing transparency in international arms transfers is an important complement to conventional disarmament. A clearer insight into each other's

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

military capabilities will help States to embark on disarmament efforts focused on systems that are perceived to be particularly threatening and, by that nature, destabilizing. The establishment this year of an international Register of Conventional Arms under the auspices of the United Nations was a significant step forward. We now look forward to all the participation of all Member States in the Register.

We welcome the inclusion of the item "Transparency in armaments" on the 1992 agenda of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva and the work already started there following the adoption of General Assembly resolution 46/36 L, which aims at the further improvement of transparency in military matters beyond the scope of the United Nations Register. We hope and expect that the Conference will play a substantial role in that field in the future - in particular, by elaborating practical means of increasing transparency in armaments.

It should, of course, be clear that weapons and equipment to be reduced as a result of the numerical limitations set forth in an agreement on reductions in conventional forces should not be transferred, directly or indirectly, to States not parties to the agreement in question.

Disarmament measures in one region should not lead to increased arms transfers to other regions. The Community and its member States believe that the subject of conventional-arms control and disarmament should be kept at the forefront of the multilateral debate on disarmament, and we stand ready to provide any assistance and expertise that we have gained in this field.

I should like now, on behalf of the European Community and its member States, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29, "Confidence- and

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe", which is sponsored by most of the 52 States participating in the CSCE.

This draft resolution aims, inter alia, at welcoming the positive developments that have occurred since last year in the negotiations on confidence- and security-building measures and conventional disarmament in Europe, as well as other related developments, in the framework of the CSCE. Let me mention these.

On 4 March 1992 the participating States of the CSCE adopted the Vienna 1992 Document on Confidence and Security Building Measures, which expanded the scope of previously agreed measures, including those providing for exchanges of information on military forces, and introduced additional measures.

On 24 March 1992, in Helsinki, 25 States signed the Open Skies Treaty, and a Declaration on the Open Skies Treaty was adopted by the Council of Ministers of the CSCE. This unprecedented agreement allows for States parties to carry out overflights, with specially equipped aircraft, of the entire territories of the participating States - an area ranging from Vancouver to Vladivostock. The Treaty is an important measure of transparency and confidence building. Six months after entry into force the Treaty will be open to the accession of other States.

On 10 July 1992, in Helsinki, the States signatories of the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) decided to put the Treaty provisionally into force as from 17 July. Formal entry into force takes place today. On 10 July the same States also adopted the Concluding Act of the Negotiation on Personnel Strength of Conventional Armed Forces in Europe - commonly known as CFE-1A. This agreement contains detailed provisions not

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

only on the limitation of manpower levels in the conventional armed forces of the participants but also on exchanges of information on such forces.

Last, but not least, on 9 and 10 July 1992, at the Helsinki Summit meeting, the Heads of State or Government of the 52 participating States of the CSCE adopted the "Helsinki Document 1992 - The Challenges of Change", which has now been distributed in United Nations document A/47/361. They decided, inter alia, to establish a new CSCE Forum for Security Co-operation, with a strengthened conflict-prevention centre, as an integral part of the CSCE. This new framework will serve to carry out the following tasks: to start new negotiations on arms control, disarmament and confidence and security building, with the participation of all CSCE States; to enhance regular consultation and to intensify cooperation between the participating States on matters related to security; and to further the process of reducing the risk of conflict.*

---

* Mr. Suh (Republic of Korea), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

The participating States will, inter alia, strengthen security and stability through the negotiation of concrete measures aimed at keeping or achieving the levels of armed forces to a minimum commensurate with common or individual legitimate security needs within Europe and beyond. These new measures may entail reductions of and limitations on conventional armed forces, and may, as appropriate, include measures of a regional character.

Those achievements are the result of a process initiated nearly 20 years ago, a process which has accelerated with the end of the cold war and the appearance of a radically new political situation in Europe.

Along with the emergence of a new community of democratic States based on common values and increased security and confidence, we are also, regrettably, witnessing in Europe new armed conflicts and massive use of force to achieve hegemony and territorial expansion. Individually and jointly, within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and the United Nations, we are working towards long-lasting solutions to the crises which have arisen. In this respect, the Helsinki decisions constitute a comprehensive programme of coordinated action which will provide additional tools for the CSCE to address tensions before violence erupts and to manage crises which may develop.

As in previous resolutions on the same subject, we propose in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29 that the General Assembly not only welcome these efforts and the positive developments in the field of confidence- and security-building and disarmament in Europe, but also invite all Member States to consider the possibility of taking appropriate measures with a view to

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

reducing the risk of confrontation and strengthening security, taking due account of their specific regional conditions.

We express the hope that this draft resolution, like previous ones on the same subject, will be adopted by consensus.

I should like finally to speak on agenda item 63 (g) and introduce, on behalf of all member States of the European Community and of the delegations of Argentina, Australia, Austria, the Bahamas, Belarus, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Finland, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Malaysia, Nepal, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Sweden, Togo, Turkey and the United States of America, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22, entitled "Implementation of the guidelines for appropriate types of confidence-building measures".

Four years ago, in its resolution 43/78 H, the General Assembly adopted the guidelines for confidence-building measures which had been worked out by the Disarmament Commission. These guidelines are a standing invitation to all States to implement such measures on a global, regional or bilateral level. The first review of the implementation of the guidelines, two years ago, in the context of resolution 45/62 F, revealed that this invitation had been widely accepted and that the guidelines had been implemented by a great number of States. Reviewing developments over the last two years, it is justified to state that this process has been further strengthened.

On a global level, four developments over the past two years deserve our particular attention. The first is the conclusion of negotiations on a Convention on chemical weapons. The concept of confidence-building is the

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

underlying rationale of a number of provisions of the Convention. The universal implementation of the Convention will enhance confidence amongst States parties.

Secondly, the launching of a universal and non-discriminatory Register of Conventional Arms, the finalization of the work of the panel of governmental experts on that matter, and the beginning of work in the Conference on Disarmament on the item "Transparency in armaments" are encouraging. An enhanced level of transparency in armaments resulting from these endeavours will represent a major contribution to confidence-building and security among States.

Thirdly, the expansion of the confidence-building-measures regime of the Convention on biological weapons, which was agreed at the third Review Conference of the Convention last year, will provide increased transparency, particularly in the area of biological defence.

Fourthly, the finalization of work on the agenda item "Objective information on military matters" at this year's session of the Disarmament Commission should be mentioned.

In his "Agenda for Peace", the Secretary-General laid particular emphasis on the importance of confidence-building measures on a regional scale in the context of preventive diplomacy, stating that:

> "Mutual confidence and good faith are essential to reducing the likelihood of conflict between States. Many such measures are available to Governments that have the will to employ them. Systematic exchange of military missions, formation of regional or subregional risk reduction centres, arrangements for the free flow of information, including the

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

monitoring of regional arms agreements, are examples. I ask all regional organisations to consider what further confidence-building measures might be applied in their areas and to inform the United Nations of the results". (A/47/277, para. 24)

It is indeed on the regional, subregional and bilateral levels that implementation of existing confidence-building measures has made good progress, and a considerable number of new confidence-building measures have been agreed upon. Confidence-building measures have been widely accepted as an important step towards prevention of conflict and, in times of political tension and crisis, as an instrument for the peaceful settlement of conflicts. This is underlined by the fact that the First Committee is considering at this year's session three draft resolutions on confidence-building measures agreed upon in different regions of the world, namely draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.2, L.24 and L.29.

Permit me to highlight some of the developments that have occurred during the last two years in various regions. In Africa, major efforts have recently been undertaken by States members of the Economic Community of Central African States to promote confidence-building measures in that particular region, as elaborated in detail in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.2, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures".

Among Asian nations, confidence-building measures seem to have become a well-established element of bilateral and regional stability, conflict prevention and increased cooperation. On a subregional scale, the increased cooperation among States parties to the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia, whose purposes and principles the First Committee is called

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

upon to endorse in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, bears witness to this development. We trust that all States parties to that Treaty will meet the commitments they have subscribed to in accordance with the principles stated therein.

We have also learned of the most recent agreements between India and Pakistan in this field, namely the agreements on advance notification of military exercises, manoeuvres and troop movements and on the prevention of air-space violations. The so-called Basic Agreement between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Republic of Korea includes confidence-building measures as an essential means of overcoming confrontation and paving the way for dialogue and cooperation.

In Latin America, the value of confidence-building measures has long been recognized. Suffice it to point to the Mendoza Declaration and the Cartagena Declaration, to the measures undertaken in the implementation of the Esquipulas II Agreement among Central American States, and to the Galapagos Declaration of 1989 among the members of the Andean Pact, as well as to the process of expanding economic integration and peaceful nuclear cooperation between Argentina and Brazil.

In the Middle East, the peace process initiated among the States of the region with the participation of other States includes multilateral efforts to agree on confidence- and security-building measures, in particular in the military field.

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

In the European region, as elaborated in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29, historic developments have taken place since the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly - developments that brought about and were accelerated by speedy progress in building confidence and laying the foundations of cooperative security structures in that region. At the same time, new conflicts have arisen in some parts of the region, including acts of aggression and use of military force, which cause deep concern. These conflicts highlight the necessity of applying confidence-building measures as a concrete, continuous and sustained process that must never stop if it is to attain its objective: to defuse conflicts, to tackle their underlying causes, and thus to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes.

As laid down in the 1988 guidelines (resolution 43/78 A), confidence-building measures are conceived of as a broad concept. Confidence reflects a set of related factors of a military as well as of a non-military character. A plurality of approaches is needed to overcome fear, tension and mistrust between States and to replace them by confidence. Confidence-building measures in the military field can play a key role in this process of overcoming distrust and confrontation and laying the foundation for new understanding, cooperation and stability. Especially when applied in a comprehensive manner, they can be conducive to achieving structures of security based on cooperation and openness and thus contribute to the wider objective of the renunciation of the threat or use of force. They can also pave the way for disarmament measures.

It is against the background of this experience that the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22 recommend the guidelines for confidence-building measures to all States for implementation and appeal to

(Sir Michael Weston, United Kingdom)

all States to consider the widest use of confidence-building measures in their international relations. We hope that draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.29 will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.36.

Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia): I have the honour and privilege to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.36, entitled "Bilateral nuclear-arms negotiations and nuclear disarmament", on behalf of the Russian Federation, the United States of America, the non-aligned countries and a large number of other countries that are sponsoring the draft.

The draft resolution reflects the profound change and transition that have occurred in the international landscape and the resultant shifts in perception and attitude towards nuclear disarmament. A significant change has been particularly evident in the conclusion of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms between the United States and the former Soviet Union, the unilateral decisions of their leaders to reduce significantly the size and nature of nuclear deployments world wide, to eliminate certain nuclear weapons, and to enhance stability. We welcome these developments as constituting substantive contributions to disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament. We welcome also the determination to seek deep reductions as well as cooperative efforts with the former Soviet Republics to ensure the safety, security and environmentally sound destruction of nuclear weapons. In this context, we look forward to a continued and constructive dialogue among them.

All Member States have a vital interest in the success of negotiations on armament limitations and a duty to contribute to efforts in the field of

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

disarmament. Bilateral and regional initiatives with regard to specific issues are useful and should be intensified. Major questions of disarmament have bilateral, regional and global implications, and negotiations at these levels can complement and reinforce one another.

The draft resolution we are submitting is the outcome of concerted efforts by the Russian Federation, the United States, the non-aligned and other interested countries, and for the first time in many years our endeavours have drawn the broad support of this Committee. It is our firm conviction that the international community should speak with one voice through the General Assembly and thereby further encourage the two major Powers to sustain the momentum of their efforts with the objective of achieving the elimination of nuclear weapons. It is in this spirit that we recommend the draft resolution for unanimous adoption.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Mexico to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40.

Mr. MARIN BOSCH (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): At the beginning of the general debate in the First Committee, on 12 October, my delegation stated that Latin America and the Caribbean were most pleased by the concrete steps that had been taken in 1992 to consolidate the denuclearization regime established by the Treaty of Tlatelolco. We were particularly gratified by the deposition by France, on 24 August, of its instruments of ratification to Additional Protocol I.

Today we are honoured, as representative of the depositary Government of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, to introduce in the First Committee the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.40, under agenda item 142, "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

The title of the item is new and this change is due to a very simple reason. For years, emphasis was placed on the two Additional Protocols open for signature, respectively, to the States which de jure or de facto are internationally responsibile for territories located within the zone of application of the Treaty and the nuclear-weapon States. Since 1974, Additional Protocol II has been in force for the five nuclear-weapon States. On this twenty-fifth anniversary of the Treaty, Additional Protocol I has come fully into force, thus ending the long first phase.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40 is sponsored by Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bolivia, Colombia, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and the United States of America.

The first seven preambular paragraphs give a brief summary of the background of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and of the way in which the General Assembly encouraged the adoption of that instrument. The Treaty was the outcome of the collective efforts of the countries of the region and of many individuals. However, the decisive contribution that ensured the success of this endeavour came from Ambassador Alfonso García Robles.

The eighth to the fourteenth preambular paragraphs summarize major events that have taken place in the past few months in respect of the Treaty of Tlatelolco. First of all, we should mention that, with the 1992 accession of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, the Treaty is now in force for 24 of the 33 sovereign States of the region. Reference is also made to the coming into force of the two Additional Protocols, and it is stated that international conditions are more propitious for the consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty.

(Mr. Marín Bosch, Mexico)

The fourth meeting of the Treaty signatories and the Seventh Special Session of the General Conference of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (OPANAL) was held on 26 August 1992 in the capital of my country. OPANAL approved and opened for signature a set of amendments to the Treaty aimed at ensuring its full implementation. This will enable full effect to be given to it in the very near future by Argentina, Brazil and Chile.

Moreover, the Government of Cuba has expressed its support for both the letter and the spirit of the Treaty and has stated that even though there are still circumstances preventing it from acceding to the Treaty, it would be prepared to do so once all the States in the region had assumed the Treaty commitments.

Under the operative part of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40 the General Assembly would welcome these concrete steps, as it would ratification by France of Additional Protocol I. It would also urge

> "all Latin American and Caribbean States to take speedily the necessary measures to attain the full entry into force of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and, in particular, the States in respect of which the Treaty is open for signature and ratification immediately to carry out the corresponding formalities so that they may become parties to that international instrument, thus contributing to the consolidation of the regime established by that Treaty". (A/C.1/47/L.40, para. 4)

Finally, the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40 express the hope that the members of the First Committee will adopt it unanimously.

Mr. VIEGAS (Brazil) (interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Brazil is pleased to have the opportunity to express its satisfaction with draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40 on consolidation of the regime established by

(Mr. Viegas, Brazil)

the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean. Brazil fully supports the text introduced by the representative of Mexico, Ambassador Marín Bosch.

In our opinion, the draft resolution adequately reflects the substantial advances achieved recently to ensure that the Treaty of Tlatelolco comes fully into force, advances as a result of which the Treaty has now been updated and strengthened.

The various amendments to the text of the Treaty of Tlatelolco proposed by Argentina, Brazil, Chile and Mexico, and adopted by acclamation at the Seventh Special Session of the General Conference of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean, are basically technical and in no way affect the Treaty's principles and purposes. Together with the ratification of Additional Protocol I by France, which we welcome, it opens up concrete prospects of the early complete entry into force of the Treaty throughout the region.

These measures are a significant step in the consolidation of an international legal instrument which can in many ways be considered a model: binding in nature, designed to ensure nuclear non-proliferation and characterized by equal rights and duties for all the States Parties to it.

I would like to repeat here the declaration of the Government of Brazil, and the Governments of Argentina and Chile, to the effect that as soon as the internal ratification process of the amended text of the Treaty is completed we will waive all the requirements set forth in paragraph 1 of article 28 of the Treaty that still remain to be met.

In this connection, we attach particular importance to the provision in paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.40, which urges:

(Mr. Viegas, Brazil)

"all Latin American and Caribbean States to take speedily the necessary measures to attain the full entry into force of the Treaty of Tlatelolco", as amended.

Mr. FUENTES IBAÑEZ (Bolivia) (interpretation from Spanish): I would like my first words in the Committee to be words of congratulation to Ambassador Elaraby and the other officers of the Committee. Ambassador Elaraby's election as Chairman is not only recognition of his outstanding attributes as a lawyer and diplomat, but an implicit tribute to his country, which 13 years ago set an example of maturity, determination to ensure peace, and pragmatism in adopting the path of negotiation, thus avoiding greater sacrifices for its people. I should also like, albeit perhaps belatedly, to extend my delegation's feelings of solidarity to the people of the capital of Egypt and other cities in that country that suffered such destruction in last month's earthquake. I also wish to pay tribute to the Chairman's predecessor, Mr. Robert Mroziewicz, who so wisely and authoritatively chaired this Committee during the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, with the invaluable cooperation of its secretariat, and particularly Mr. Kheradi, whom I greet and to whom I pledge our cooperation.

The historic process of international relations since the 1940s has in my view had two turning points in bringing to fruition the international community's constant desire for a new order, now known as the new world order. Two options put hope on the horizon after the devastation and suffering of war. The first came about at the end of the Second World War. Its birth, in the United Nations Charter, would seem from this distance in

(Mr. Fuentes Ibáñez, Bolivia)

time to be an act of contrition following the numerous holocausts that the war created on all battlefronts.*

Looking back across the years, we see that we should have put behind us the invasions, violating all the norms of law, the concentration and extermination camps, the implacable bombardments of London, Coventry and Dunkirk and the subsequent reprisals that left Berlin in ruins. Shortly afterwards Hiroshima and Nagasaki were devastated in the first experiments on civilian targets. Thus nuclear energy made its diabolical entry onto the scene as an apocalyptic weapon. And thus began the cycle of cold war, just two months after the signing of the Charter in San Francisco.

While the majority of the founding Members of the Organization tried to implement and strengthen the principles enshrined in our Charter, some, sceptical about the weakness of human nature, tried to subordinate those noble ideals to their own desire to dominate, interpreting them as a tacit concession of privilege as the fruits of victory. As a result, they enlarged their arsenals and developed their military potential, with no other justification than protection of their security interests, wherever they deemed it necessary. They deliberately overlooked the fact that, as the representative of Togo said in the Committee:

"Military deterrence does not guarantee peace or security."

(A/C.1/47/PV.14, p. 16)

---

* The Chairman returned to the Chair.

(Mr. Fuentes Ibáñez, Bolivia)

That is a maxim that we developing countries fully support, as a genuine programme to avoid wars requires the creation of conditions for dignified coexistence. And this can be achieved only by eliminating all forms of oppression and subjugation, whether due to poverty, through lack of access to health care and education, or a lack of fairly paid work.

(Mr. Fuentes-Ibáñez, Bolivia)

Thus, a feudal regime that seemed to be behind us for ever began to re-emerge. Such an anachronism can be maintained only through the depressing and deceptive persuasive action of nuclear warheads or supersonic aircraft, tanks and guns, for the ravages wreaked by conventional weapons during the recent Gulf war, as was confirmed in this forum, were said to be the equivalent of seven atomic bombs used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which, according to recent reports in The New York Times, killed 60,000 and 80,000 persons, respectively. This demonstrates not only that has progress been made in applying atomic energy to surface-to-air or air-to-air internally or remote-controlled missiles, which are now patrolling the world from land, sea or in the air, but also that there has been an ongoing refinement in conventional weapons, which are freely traded, thus increasingly impoverishing peoples when used against one another in pursuit of Utopian hegemonies in disregard of the fact that peace itself will always be ephemeral as long as we fail to work together to overcome the problems that are hindering the harmonious and sustained development of humanity on our planet. In this spirit we join the sponsors of the draft resolutions concerning all aspects of general and complete disarmament, in particular, those concerning the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons and its logical complement, the draft resolution on agenda item 54: "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

It is no secret to anyone that the cold war encouraged an arms build-up and contributed greatly to an increase in social problems. The producers of such weapons find a favourable market in the developing countries for ridding themselves of surpluses. Encouraged by the possibility of acquiring expensive weapons, which they can pay off over the long term, the developing countries do not hesitate to increase their defence budgets to the detriment of such

(Mr. Fuentes Ibáñez, Bolivia)

urgent items as health, education and housing. What is even more disturbing is that they also yield to the temptation of security based on military power. If those countries had spent on such items even a fraction of the amount used to arm themselves, they could have avoided the moral and economic collapse that dashed the hopes created by the ideological panaceas endorsed by their Governments. For all these reasons, my delegation joins in supporting the useful views that we have heard on arms build-up, and reconfirms its conviction that our goal must be general and complete disarmament and good faith among States.

We believe that a historic step is being taken through the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/47/L.1, on prohibition of the production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons, to which the Ambassador of Germany to the Conference on Disarmament, Mr. Adolf Ritter von Wagner, has devoted so much effort, and of which my delegation has the honour of being one of the sponsors. While achievement of the goal - that is, the signing of the Convention, which will take place in Paris in 1993 - has taken 20 years, we must, with equal determination and encouraged by this achievement, face undaunted the difficult task that is before us, the task of ensuring a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapons. We hope that this action will not take such a long time and that we can count on the cooperation of that select minority whose security is based on a privilege that is in every way discriminatory vis-à-vis the other members of the international community.

Our commitment to peace has been, and will continue to be, unswerving, and we welcome any move towards the objective of disarmament. We welcome the decisions taken by some Powers to refrain from nuclear tests for a specified time - a moratorium that we hope will lead to the complete elimination of this odious practice.

(Mr. Fuentes Ibáñez, Bolivia)

Need we say how much we welcome the broad acceptance of the pioneer institution in the field of disarmament, the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Acceptance of the amendments proposed by Argentina, Brazil and Chile opened the way for its prompt entry into force. The Treaty of Rarotonga also covers a broad geographical area, which should be supplemented by similar agreements in the countries scattered in the Pacific Ocean archipelagos, as their insular isolation exposes them to the risks of nuclear tests or of deposits of atomic wastes in their adjacent waters. The draft resolution submitted by Mauritania in document A/C.1/47/L.13 is relevant in that regard. This environmental protection movement, which seeks a legal barrier to protect the signatories from such risks, deserves our full support.

In the course of our deliberations we have listened to several distressing statements on the vast increase in weapons production. Certain countries that are still in the developing world none the less have factories for the manufacture of high-technology conventional weapons. Reliable sources have stated that once peace has been achieved or through demobilized forces or deserters, countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, particularly those in which there have been civil wars, have many options for obtaining the latest models of firearms at bargain prices, because once these weapons have been used or are no longer in the immediate control of those who acquired them, they lose their real value and become instruments used in crimes or they are auctioned off to the highest bidder. Here again, regional disarmament can be most useful.

Fortunately, there are indications that the changes that we so much desire are well under way. We are particularly pleased about the strategic arms limitation agreements signed between the United States and the former

(Mr. Fuentes Ibáñez, Bolivia)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. With regard to the verification system, we should mention the outstanding contribution made by the International Atomic Energy Agency, whose cooperation is always effective in the clarification of situations relating to the possession of nuclear facilities or precursors for the use of atomic energy for military purposes or illicit trade, as is clear from the sudden increase in countries with such factories.

Another historic landmark that I had in mind at the beginning of my statement is the possibility that we might be on the threshold of a new cycle - a new era that seemed to be heralded by a rainbow of peace following the end of the Persian Gulf war, a ray of peace of which, to some extent, we caught a glimpse. This conflict was not as widespread as the two previous wars, but given the vast resources deployed and the loss of human life and material property involved, there were grounds for a meeting unprecedented in the history of the United Nations, the Meeting of the Heads of State and Government of the members of the Security Council held on 31 January 1992.

The January Summit Meeting sounded a warning note with regard to failure to comply with some of the principles proclaimed in the Charter, witness the conflicts in various regions of the world in the half century since the San Francisco Conference. The Declaration of Heads of State and Government at that Summit Meeting was duly followed up by Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali in his "Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) and expanded on in the report given in his statement on 27 October on the occasion of Disarmament Week. In that report the Secretary-General called on the international community "to integrate disarmament" (A/C.1/47/PV.18, p. 12), that is, to take part in any initiatives that could contribute to the strengthening of peace in response to the destructive violence of war as the antithesis of peace.

(Mr. Fuentes Ibáñez, Bolivia)

The doctrine has been laid down. The instruments that we have can be improved. Much can be done through the proper use of preventive diplomacy at the regional and international levels. There is a phased process involved, leading to a single goal, that is, peace-building, restoration of peace where peace has been breached and consolidation of peace, which should not correspond to a subjective ideal but rather to a deep conviction based on balance, reflecting the rights and duties that are a prerequisite for peace. For peace cannot be imposed by force; rather, it should come from a sovereign agreement, without preferences or paternalism, that is, through the optimal implementation of confidence-building measures as a basis for dialogue leading to spiritual disarmament and negotiation.

(Mr. Fuentes Ibáñez, Bolivia)

Nothing is more instructive than history. Recent events that we have observed and witnessed from a distance that has been miraculously overcome by modern technology have allowed us to observe just how far the obstinate blindness of those who have opted for violence can go. We have just seen this in the collapse of one of the protagonists in the bipolar confrontation of the cold war.

The alienation resulting from the possession of weapons is a vicious circle. First, the lion's share of financial resources is allocated to enhancing the creative capacity of scientists and technologists so that they can apply their theories and turn them into instruments of the mass destruction on which their diabolical effectiveness depends, and then we get the State and business interests that instead of making tractors, ploughs and the communications and transport equipment to bind people together in a crusade for peace, divert those resources into the production of armoured cars, tanks and weapons of every calibre needed to do their job of extermination with the greatest precision. Thus there has been a conjunction of interests involving all social classes engaged in a business that is annihilating the conscience of the human race inasmuch as it has to do with highly profitable industries which, paradoxically, are seen as factors of development and social stability.

Another measure that is useful by anyone's standards is the verification and registration, by the United Nations, of arms transfers; I would make just one further point about this, which is that the arms Register should come with additional lists giving the area of each country, its population, its economic resources and the ratio of its military budget to its expenditures on social security. Of course, the effectiveness of this proposal is based not so much

(Mr. Fuentes Ibáñez, Bolivia)

on the transparency of the system as on the honesty of the Governments responsible for providing the information and on what opportunities they afford for carrying out the effective monitoring that, without adversely affecting the sovereignty of the country providing information for the Register, can give the truest picture possible of reality. This is conducive to confidence-building.

These are the general outlines within which we shall give our fullest support to the draft resolutions that are to be considered by our Committee and that we hope it will adopt.

The CHAIRMAN: As I stated at an earlier meeting, an informal paper setting out the list of all the draft resolutions on all disarmament agenda items in six different clusters has been prepared, after careful consideration, by the officers of the Committee.

In this connection, I should like to indicate that I have tried to distribute the paper containing the clusters as early as possible in order to enable delegations to undertake the necessary consultations and to seek instructions, as appropriate, from their capitals, with a view to facilitating the smooth conduct of the work of the Committee during the voting procedure.

These clusters, as members are well aware, were devised by the officers of the Committee on the basis of the pattern that has evolved during the past several years, with, I may add, some changes in accordance with the circumstances of this year. In the process of grouping the various draft resolutions, the officers of the Committee took into account the most logical and practical criteria available, and made every effort to group them according to related subject-matter, to the extent possible.

Furthermore, I should like to stress that no other significance should be attached to this endeavour than the desire to facilitate and expedite the work

(The Chairman)

of the Committee with a view to utilizing fully and in the most effective and efficient manner possible the time and conference facilities available for this phase of the Committee's work.

With regard to the programme of work and timetable for action on draft resolutions, on the basis of precedent it is my intention to move, in so far as possible, from one cluster to another sequentially upon the conclusion of action on each cluster. Nevertheless, in following this procedure I should stress that we shall of course maintain the desired degree of flexibility. Whenever I am in a position to give a precise indication of the days on which any particular cluster will be taken up, I shall advise the Committee accordingly.

The procedure during the decision-taking stage on each cluster will be that delegations will first have the opportunity to make any introduction, or statements other than in explanation of vote, that they regard as necessary with respect to the draft resolutions listed in that cluster. Subsequently, delegations wishing to explain their positions or votes on any or all of the draft resolutions in a particular cluster before a decision is taken will be able to do so. Then, after the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions contained in a given cluster, delegations will be able to explain their positions or votes if they wish to do so.

In order that the Committee's work may proceed in a systematic and efficient manner, delegations are urged to make, as far as possible, only one statement in explanation of position or vote on the draft resolutions in a given cluster.

I do hope that the Committee is in agreement with the programme of work and the procedures that I have just outlined. If I hear no objection, I shall

(The Chairman)

take it that the Committee approves the suggested programme and the procedure that I have outlined, and that it will accordingly proceed to the stage of taking action on disarmament draft resolutions beginning on Thursday, 12 November.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the Secretary of the Committee to make some announcements.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become co-sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.1: Burkina Faso;

A/C.1/47/L.8: Czechoslovakia;

A/C.1/47/L.15: Australia, Austria, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Hungary, Norway, Peru, Poland and Russian Federation;

A/C.1/47/L.18: Albania;

A/C.1/47/L.20: Albania and Hungary;

A/C.1/47/L.24: Albania, Estonia and Malta;

A/C.1/47/L.25: Albania, Czechoslovakia and Poland;

A/C.1/47/L.26: Viet Nam;

A/C.1/47/L.30: Albania, Algeria, Canada and Singapore;

A/C.1/47/L.35: Albania, Czechoslovakia and Hungary;

A/C.1/47/L.36: Kazakhstan;

A/C.1/47/L.37: Bulgaria, Egypt, Italy and Kazakhstan;

A/C.1/47/L.42/Rev.1: Denmark, Russian Federation, Singapore and Thailand.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
28th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 10 November 1992
at 10.30 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 28th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. ELARABY	(Egypt)
later:	Mr. PATOKALLIO (Vice-Chairman)	(Finland)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61798 2693V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.28
4 December 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 11.20 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142; 67 and 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Peru, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25.

Mr. VASQUEZ (Peru) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation has the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25, entitled "Regional disarmament", on behalf of the delegations of Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Togo, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay.

By the preambular part of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would recall its resolutions 44/116 U and 44/117 B of 15 December 1989, 45/58 M of 4 December 1990 and 46/36 F of 6 December 1991. The Assembly would consider that the regional approach to disarmament is one of the most important means by which States can contribute to the strengthening of international security, arms limitation and disarmament and recognize that the regional and global approaches complement each other and can be pursued simultaneously in the promotion of regional and international peace and security.

(Mr. Vasquez, Peru)

The Assembly would also state its conviction that disarmament can be carried out only in a climate of confidence based on mutual respect and aimed at ensuring better relations founded on justice, solidarity and cooperation, and would note that the consumption of resources for potentially destructive purposes is in stark contrast to the need for social and economic development, and that reduction in military expenditure following, inter alia, the conclusion of regional disarmament agreements could entail benefits in both the social and the economic fields.

The General Assembly would note also that disarmament measures in one region should not lead to increased arms transfers to other regions or extend the military imbalances and/or tensions from one area to other areas, and would consider also that confidence-building and transparency measures are essential elements in the implementation of regional disarmament.

In the operative part of the draft resolution, the Assembly would reaffirm that the regional approach to disarmament is one of the essential elements in the global efforts to strengthen international peace and security, and would state that it is convinced of the importance and effectiveness of regional disarmament measures taken at the initiative of States of the region and with the participation of all States concerned.

It would affirm that comprehensive political and peaceful settlement of regional conflicts and disputes can contribute to the reduction of tension and the promotion of regional peace, security and stability. It would stress the importance of confidence-building measures, including objective information on military matters.

(Mr. Vasquez, Peru)

The Assembly would affirm also that multifaceted cooperation between States in the region, encompassing political, economic, social and cultural fields, can be conducive to the strengthening of regional security and stability. It would note with satisfaction the important progress made in various regions of the world through the adoption of arms limitation, security and cooperation agreements, including those related to the prohibition of weapons of mass destruction, and would encourage States in the regions concerned to continue implementing those agreements.

The General Assembly would encourage States of the same region to examine the possibility of creating, on their own initiative, regional mechanisms and/or institutions for the establishment of measures in the framework of an effort of regional disarmament or for the prevention and the peaceful settlement of disputes with the assistance, if requested, of the United Nations.

Finally, the Assembly would invite and encourage all States to conclude, whenever possible, agreements on arms limitation and confidence-building measures at the regional level, including those conducive to avoiding the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

In view of regional disarmament's growing importance in the United Nations, and in view of the fact that in recent years the majority of resolutions on this subject have been adopted by consensus, Peru considers that at future sessions of this Committee members should make further efforts to merge, as far as possible, the various draft resolutions on this item in order to give the sharpest possible focus at the multilateral level to the question of regional disarmament.

(Mr. Vasquez, Peru)

Finally, my delegation hopes that, like its predecessors, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25 will be adopted by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Singapore, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24.

Mr. CHEW (Singapore): Let me say first, Sir, that I am very pleased to see you in the Chair at this session.

On behalf of its sponsors, I have the honour of introducing, under agenda item 62 (b), "Regional confidence-building measures", draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24, entitled "Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia". The draft resolution has 133 sponsors, which are listed on its first page or whose names have been read out in the Committee in recent days; I shall not read them out now.

The Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia has been acceded to by all six States members of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN): Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. The objective of the Treaty is to promote perpetual peace, everlasting amity and cooperation between the peoples of South-East Asia. The Treaty provides a framework for cooperation in many fields, as well as a mechanism for the pacific settlement of disputes. Since coming into force in 1976 the Treaty has been an important instrument of regional confidence-building, contributing to the peace and stability that have underpinned the economic growth and development of ASEAN countries. In 1989 Papua New Guinea acceded to the Treaty; this year, in July, Viet Nam and the Lao People's Democratic Republic also acceded to the Treaty.

(Mr. Chew, Singapore)

The recent end of the cold war has brought a climate of enhanced regional and global cooperation. Countries in South-East Asia are now able to concentrate on economic cooperation, growth and development. The Treaty has thus grown in relevance and importance in the sphere of the maintenance of international peace and security in line with the United Nations Charter.

(Mr. Chew, Singapore)

In his report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) the Secretary-General has called for a closer relationship between the United Nations and regional associations, particularly mentioning the role such associations can play in regional confidence-building as part of preventive diplomacy and peace-building. In response to his call, the Parties to the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia have submitted this draft resolution to seek United Nations cognizance of and support for the Treaty. We have been joined by a large number of sponsors from all regions of the world, including the Dialogue Partners of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN). The ASEAN members and other States Parties to the Treaty are grateful for an encouraged by the support of the other sponsors, and we wish to express our deep appreciation to all of them. We all share the view that regional peace and security and development are building blocks in United Nations efforts in the maintenance of international peace and security. Such regional efforts need the support of the international community of nations, embodied by the United Nations, as they enhance the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 is simple and straightforward. It seeks in the one operative paragraph the General Assembly's endorsement of the purposes and principles of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia. It is the wish of the 133 sponsors - that number is still growing - that the draft resolution be adopted by consensus.

Mr. CHO (Republic of Korea): As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24 on the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in South-East Asia, which has just been introduced by the representative of Singapore, the Republic of Korea would like to express its support for the draft resolution.

My delegation believes that endorsement of the Treaty by the Committee and the General Assembly would appropriately reflect the new trend in arms control and disarmament efforts, which we should pursue more actively in the future to obtain global peace and security.

Indeed, the Secretary-General in his reports "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277) and "New dimensions of arms regulation and disarmament in the post-cold-war era" rightly points out that regional arrangements have great potential to contribute to preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping, peacemaking and post-conflict peace-building, and that many States have a growing interest in developing regional approaches to arms limitation and confidence-building.

Furthermore, the General Assembly has already expressed its support for efforts to implement confidence-building measures at the regional and sub-regional level. My delegation believes that the United Nations practice of endorsing regional efforts will lead to the stable and efficient functioning of confidence-building measures at the regional level.

It is commendable of the ASEAN countries and other States Parties to the Treaty to promote the common objective of regional confidence-building, leaving behind previous differences such as those which preceded their agreement on the Cambodian issue. Clearly, they have set an excellent example to the rest of the world by working together to achieve regional security.

(Mr. Cho, Republic of Korea)

My delegation believes that the draft resolution will positively influence the region's perception of confidence-building and provide further momentum for confidence-building measures in other regions of the world as well.

Therefore, the Republic of Korea would like the Committee to adopt the draft resolution by consensus.

Mr. SIGMUNDSSON (Iceland): The past three years have been a time of remarkable dynamism on the international scene. With the end of the East-West conflict and the demise of the Soviet Union, we are, for the first time in decades, presented with great new opportunities, not least in the field of cooperative security.

However, as has been demonstrated by the debate in the Committee during the past few weeks and the draft resolutions submitted, the passing of the cold war has not brought to an end efforts to safeguard peace and stability through arms control and disarmament. The negative stability of the cold war has given way to a highly volatile and unpredictable international situation. While we rejoice at the disappearance of the spectre of nuclear Armageddon, there is justified reason for apprehension on account of the multiple threats posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and destabilizing regional or localized build-up of conventional forces.

Meanwhile, the whole concept of security has become more diffuse and multidimensional. The predominantly military perspective of major post-war security policies is to an increasing extent being overtaken by political, economic and environmental aspects. Despite the traditional distinction between disarmament and confidence-building, the boundaries between the two are likely to become more blurred as greater attention will be focused on

(Mr. Sigmundsson, Iceland)

transparentcy of intentions rather than on military capabilities. Furthermore, this will call for greater institutional collaboration, both on the global and regional levels.

It will thus be increasingly important for the United Nations to draw on the resources of regional organizations such as the Atlantic Alliance and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). The latter is currently initiating deliberations within the newly established Forum for Security Cooperation. Iceland hopes that this new Forum will become an effective venue for the consolidation of multilateral arms control in Europe and the focal point of increasing emphasis on confidence-building. The Treaty on Open Skies, which was signed in Helsinki last March and will shortly be ratified in Iceland, is an excellent example of confidence-building measures extending over the vast geographic area from Vancouver to Vladivostok.

Whatever the future may hold, we must continue to pay close attention to the demands posed by the implementation and verification of recent major arms control agreements, which have global implications. This requirement alone will consume much time and effort in the near future. Obviously, the reduction of excessive nuclear arsenals remains the single most urgent objective in international arms control. The unilateral decisions by the United States and Russia in 1991 to eliminate their ground-launched tactical nuclear weapons and the subsequent announcements of far-reaching reductions in strategic arms in June 1992 bode well, but will largely have to be assessed on the basis of the transparency and security of their implementation.

(Mr. Sigmundsson, Iceland)

Turning to the tasks in hand, we find that our Committee will be addressing several draft resolutions on issues of great importance. First and foremost, there is the historic result of the Conference on Disarmament, as contained in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.1, on the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. Iceland is a co-sponsor of the draft resolution and intends to become an original signatory of the Convention in Paris next January.

Secondly, Iceland has once more sponsored the draft resolution - this year it is A/C.1/47/L.37 - regarding a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty, which would constitute an important strengthening of non-proliferation and a significant contribution to the protection of the environment.

Thirdly, Iceland considers draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.6, "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons: the 1995 Conference and its Preparatory Committee", to be crucial for the future of the Treaty, which should be extended indefinitely.

(Mr. Sigmundsson, Iceland)

Fourthly, Iceland welcomes the submission of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18, on transparency in armaments, which is an important follow-up to the resolution adopted last year. The potential of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms is enthusiastically recognized in various relevant multilateral forums, and the additional scrutiny of production as well as of purchases and sales will reinforce the Register still further.

These are only four of the many constructive draft resolutions introduced in the Committee. However, Iceland hopes that they, in particular, will receive the undivided attention and support of members.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Belgium, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28

Mr. SERVAIS (Belgium) (interpretation from French): As Chairman of the Conference on Disarmament, I had the honour to submit to the First Committee on 12 October last the report of the Conference on Disarmament on the work of its 1992 session.

Following the suggestion of a large number of delegations, Belgium is now submitting to the First Committee draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28, on the adoption of the report, which this year is of obvious importance. In the draft before you the General Assembly would reaffirm the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum and welcome the conclusion of negotiations on the draft Convention on chemical weapons, which is the subject of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.1. In the operative part, and indeed in the preamble, the General Assembly would express the determination of the Conference on Disarmament to fulfil its role in the light of the evolving international situation and would encourage the ongoing review of its agenda, membership and methods of work.

(Mr. Servais, Belgium)

I wish here to stress the constructive spirit of members of the Conference on Disarmament and their resolve to discharge their duties, bearing in mind the different aspects of disarmament and international security. I wish also to welcome here the ongoing positive contribution to the work of the Conference made by the delegations of States that I always have difficulty in calling "non-members", which are not mentioned in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28. In addition, I would be unfair and remiss were I not to acknowledge once again the devotion and professionalism of the Secretary-General of the Conference on Disarmament and his entire team.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28 is the result of intense consultations and negotiations that have led to its present form, which is likely to command the broadest support in the First Committee. That is certainly the sincere hope of my delegation, which considers that adoption of the draft resolution without a vote - that is, by consensus - would represent welcome encouragement to the Conference on Disarmament in its important work of meeting the challenges of strengthening peace and international security.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of India, who will introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32.

Mr. CHANDRA (India): On behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Belarus, Bhutan, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Hungary, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, Venezuela and my own country, I would like to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32, entitled "Scientific and technological developments and their impact on international security".

The world community has acknowledged that disarmament has to be tackled not merely quantitatively but also qualitatively. The qualitative aspect of disarmament, however, has not received the attention and action that it deserves. In 1988, at the third special session of the General Assembly

(Mr. Chandra, India)

devoted to Disarmament, India had, accordingly, voiced its concern through a paper on the qualitative aspects of disarmament. In its resolution 43/77 A, adopted with the broad support of the international community, the General Assembly had requested the Secretary-General to follow future scientific and technological developments, especially those which had potential military applications, and to evaluate their impact on international security. It is commonly recognized that science and technology are per se neutral and can have both positive and negative effects on the international security environment.

In the report of the Secretary-General on this subject, contained in document A/45/568, it was made clear that in some respects modern technological advances may be hindering rather than helping the pursuit of international security. Five broad fields were identified for following scientific and technological developments: nuclear technology, space technology, materials technology, information technology and biotechnology. The cumulative impact of individual developments in these five areas could substantively transform the security environment. Taking the illustrative set of criteria elaborated in the report into account, it was suggested in the report that the international community needed to be better equipped to follow the nature and direction of technological change, and that the United Nations could serve as a catalyst and a clearing-house of ideas in this regard.

The Conference on New Trends in Science and Technology: Implications for International Peace and Security, held in April 1990 in Sendai, Japan, saw a convergence of views favouring the goal of a more active and effective multilateral collaboration in the area of technology assessment in which the United Nations should play a leading role, the purpose of which would be to improve predictability as to the future and to foster greater public awareness. It was also recognized that there was a need for the scientific

(Mr. Chandra, India)

and policy communities to work together in dealing with the complex implications of technological change from a truly global perspective. It was the conclusion of the Sendai Conference that in view of the inherent dualities of the technological process, dialogue and mutual reassurance were required to make sure that innovations with military applications did not trigger suspicions or competitive response and that the United Nations could and should play a leading role in such activity.

The Secretary-General was therefore requested - in resolution 45/60 - to continue to follow scientific and technological developments and to provide to the General Assembly at its forty-seventh session a framework for technology assessment, guided, inter alia, by the criteria suggested in his report in document A/45/568. In his interim report (A/47/355), dated 10 August 1992, issued at the current session of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General has stated that he would take the outcome of the deliberations in the United Nations Disarmament Commission on its agenda item entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields" fully into account in the development of a framework that would

> "provide the international community with an indeed useful instrument for the assessment of scientific and technological developments." (A/47/355, para. 9)

The purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.32 is to encourage the Secretary-General in his efforts in this regard, in order to provide such an instrument to the international community at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

We are confident that a shared awareness of technological advances and their channelisation to peaceful purposes can only help in creating a happier world and a safer security environment.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

Only watchfulness and collective action can restrain trends which undermine global security. We have a common future and must demonstrate a common determination to give science and technology a human face. The challenges of eradicating poverty and its attendant social problems, along with the problems of global warming, ozone depletion, environment management and the verification, conversion and safe disposal of weapons, all of which have acquired a global dimension, require our inventiveness and cooperation on a global basis. Scientific and technological developments must continue, but should be oriented in favour of peaceful uses for the benefit of mankind.

My delegation, and the others on whose behalf we have introduced the draft resolution, hope that it will receive the Committee's serious consideration and support.

I should now like to move on to the introduction of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33.

Over the last month we have heard many statements welcoming the positive changes that have occurred in the political, military and security situation in the world. The end of the cold war and East-West confrontation, the unilateral decisions to dismantle and destroy some portions of awesome nuclear arsenals and the unilateral moratoriums by some nuclear-weapon States on nuclear-weapon testing are indeed very welcome, albeit delayed, changes which we have noted with satisfaction. But we also believe that, welcome as these changes are, they must not blind us to the other reality, relating to changes that have not taken place.

There is no change in the thinking that nuclear weapons are still necessary for security, no change in approach with regard to the doctrine of deterrence and no change in the policy of reserving the right to conduct nuclear explosions for weapons purposes. Despite the end of East-West

(Mr. Chandra, India)

confrontation, existing nuclear arsenals can still destroy the world several times over. There is also no change in the reluctance to renounce the right to use, or threaten to use, nuclear weapons, despite the fact that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought.

The overwhelming majority of humanity wants a nuclear-weapon-free world. It wants complete nuclear disarmament and the elimination of all nuclear weapons on Earth and in outer space. These are our goals and objectives, and they remain humanity's immutable objectives, which cannot be changed or diluted, regardless of improvements in the international climate.

My delegation believes that these are achievable objectives, despite the differences of perception on their realization. My delegation is optimistic that, just as the international community has now completed negotiations on the elimination of toxic chemical weapons and a total ban on their use, production and stockpiling, we will one day negotiate a convention on banning the use of nuclear weapons, on cessation of all nuclear-weapon tests, on prohibiting the production of nuclear weapons and on their complete elimination. But we believe that it is necessary to reiterate these goals and to pursue proposals to achieve them. These proposals do not become irrelevant or unnecessary because of the improved political climate. In fact, the improved political climate is conducive to the implementation of the ideas contained in draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.33, which we have presented.

It is in this spirit that my delegation wishes to introduce that draft resolution, on "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". It is sponsored by Algeria, Bangladesh, Bolivia, Bhutan, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Viet Nam and India.

(Mr. Chandra, India)

Under the draft resolution the General Assembly would reiterate the conviction that the complete elimination of nuclear weapons leading to general and complete disarmament remains the goal; would call upon the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations to conclude an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances; and would put forward a draft convention as a basis for those negotiations.

We are privileged to introduce the draft resolution on behalf of all its sponsors, to whom we extend our thanks.

We urge Member States to make a further positive contribution to the changed international climate by supporting this draft resolution and subsequently to take action on its implementation.

The CHAIRMAN: I now call on the Permanent Representative of Indonesia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23.

Mr. WISNUMURTI (Indonesia): It is indeed a privilege for me to introduce, on behalf of the non-aligned countries, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.23.

The draft resolution, dealing with the "Relationship between disarmament and development" is procedural in nature. Under it the General Assembly would welcome the report of the Secretary-General (A/47/452) and actions taken to implement the relevant provisions of the Final Document adopted by the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development, held in 1987. The Secretary-General would be requested to continue those endeavours and to submit a report to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session.

In a world of growing interdependence, the promotion of an integrated approach to the issues of disarmament and development and the fashioning of an

(Mr. Wisnumurti, Indonesia)

operationally feasible and productive relationship between them would be in the common interest of all countries. Development contributes to the easing of a vast array of non-military threats to security. Furthermore, in the light of the current reality of deepening crisis in the global monetary, financial and trading systems, of sluggish economic growth projections and continuing structural imbalances and rigidities in the global economy, the need to reallocate resources away from military purposes and towards socio-economic purposes has moved beyond the moral plane and has become a political and moral imperative.

For these reasons, we attach exceptional importance to this issue and hope that the Committee will adopt the draft resolution without a vote.

Mr. WU Chengjiang (China) (interpretation from Chinese): I am speaking to reaffirm China's principled position on the prevention of an arms race in outer space.

Over the years, while no substantive negotiations have been conducted in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on the agenda item entitled "Prevention of an arms race in outer space", some countries have been carrying out research on, and developing, outer-space weapons, and they are still doing so. The extension of new types of weaponry into outer space cannot but arouse grave concern among the international community.

Outer space belongs to all mankind and should be used for peaceful purposes and the good of humanity. Therefore, no country should develop outer-space weapons for any reason.

China supports the complete prohibition and total destruction of outer-space weapons and advocates that countries with space capabilities should take measures forthwith to stop the arms race in outer space, with the comprehensive prohibition of outer-space weapons as the highest priority.

(Mr. Mu Chengjiang, China)

In this connection countries with the largest space capabilities should bear special responsibilities. It is imperative for them to stop immediately the development, testing, production and stockpiling of outer-space weapons and to destroy all existing ones. China is of the view that in order to achieve the goal of preventing an arms race in outer space it is necessary to take the following measures: first, comprehensively to prohibit all types of outer-space weapons, including anti-ballistic missiles and anti-satellite weapons, so as to realize the non-weaponization of outer space; secondly, to prohibit the use of force or acts of hostility in, from or towards outer space.

Although a few existing international legal instruments in the area of outer space play a certain role, they are far from adequate in keeping weapons from being introduced into outer space. In view of this, China supports the proposal that the Conference on Disarmament should carry out substantive negotiations as soon as possible for the purpose of reaching, at an early date an agreement containing the above-mentioned provisions.

On the basis of that principled position, the Chinese delegation has continued, as it has done in the past few years in the Committee, its consultations with non-aligned countries and other parties concerned with a view to arriving at a single draft resolution, thereby demonstrating the shared wishes of the international community on this important item. On the whole, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.34 reflects China's position and we have joined in sponsoring it. At the same time I should also like to point out that the Chinese delegation believes that devising measures for transparency, confidence and security in the context of preventing an arms race in outer space cannot replace or compromise substantive negotiations aimed at an international agreement preventing an arms race in outer space and banning outer-space weapons.

Mr. KAREM (Egypt)(interpretation from Arabic): In line with your directive, Sir, I will not congratulate you on the excellent way in which you are chairing the Committee but I was hoping to be given the opportunity to express my pleasure at seeing such a capable Egyptian Ambassador chair the work of the Committee for the first time since 1960. While expressing my regret that you have not afforded me the opportunity to congratulate you, at least let me express my pleasure at working once again under your chairmanship as it has been my pleasure and honour to do since 1974.

I address the Committee today to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", under Agenda item 55. It is indeed the annual draft resolution submitted by our delegation, one that has gained vast international and regional support throughout the years and one that has become a cornerstone of disarmament and arms reduction efforts in the Middle East and of the enhancement of peace and security in a region that has suffered far too long the ravages of war and armed conflicts.*

In 1974, the General Assembly, at the joint initiative of Egypt and Iran, adopted, for the first time, a resolution on this subject. That resolution has continued to be adopted by consensus since 1980. The delegation of Egypt wishes to put on record the very positive developments that have moved the Egyptian initiative toward new prospects of cooperation and led to the publication of the Secretary-General's report entitled "Study on effective and verifiable measures which would facilitate the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East", document A/45/435 issued on 10 October 1990. The study included numerous ideas and proposals which

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

(Mr. Karem, Egypt)

reflect international and regional interest in implementing the elements of that initiative and translating them into reality.

I refer in particular to paragraph 110 of the study which underscored inter alia the need to understand and deal with the fears of the various States in the Middle East and to build confidence on all sides.

Several States have sent replies to the Secretary-General when the study was presented containing opinions which did not diverge from the lofty objective of establishing that nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East region.

In its reply to the Secretary-General dated 29 April 1991, document A/46/291, Egypt invited the Secretary-General to address a questionnaire to the States of the Middle East regarding the annex to the study to ascertain their rules regarding the principal elements of a zonal arrangement, especially with regard to: (a) its geographical extent; (b) the list of its basic prohibitions; (c) the verification of compliance with those prohibitions; (d) the commitments towards the zone to be made by States outside the region; (e) the duration of the relevant arrangement; (f) provisions regarding adjacent areas; (g) relationships to other similar zones; (h) relationships to other international agreements; (i) technical clauses such as verification and withdrawal provisions.

The Middle East is currently the stage of historic events as a result of the initiation of the peace process and the ongoing negotiations between all the States parties to that process. The peace conference has led to several multilateral negotiations dealing with issues of disarmament and arms reduction. The States parties have met in Washington and Moscow and will meet again soon in Washington where the parties are now preparing their positions.

(Mr. Karem, Egypt)

Undoubtedly, the present positive conditions and the resultant favourable climate give us hope and confidence that the provisions of that important initiative will be implemented and will free the Middle East from the threat of a nuclear war, prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the region, strengthen the security of the region's States, ward off the dangers of nuclear armament and create an appropriate climate for mutual trust between the parties concerned.

The draft resolution before you aims at achieving those very objectives within the following frameworks: first, it recommends that all States in the region refrain, on a reciprocal basis, from producing, acquiring or in any other way possessing nuclear weapons and nuclear explosive devices and from permitting the stationing of nuclear weapons on their territory by any third party.

(Mr. Karem, Egypt)

Secondly, the draft resolution urges the States of the region to refrain from adopting any measures which would contradict the objectives of the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

In this context, the Egyptian draft resolution before you (A/C.1/47/L.11) includes several measures which are to be adopted in order to take advantage of the political momentum and achieve the objectives of the establishment of such a zone.

For example: (i) It invites all countries of the region to adhere to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to agree to place all their nuclear activities under International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards. (ii) It invites all countries of the region to declare their support for the establishment of such a zone, and to make the binding legal undertakings to ensure the rejection of the nuclear option. (iii) It calls on all States outside the region, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to respect their commitment to the conditions of the establishment of such a zone. (iv) It calls for confidence building between the States of the region while ensuring openness and transparency in the field of nuclear programmes. (v) It calls for the adoption of comprehensive verification measures that would guarantee adherence by all Parties to their commitments, and to the objective of the initiative throughout the stages of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region and the provision of the necessary guarantees of security for all the States of the region.

My country's delegation believes that the present circumstances present us with an historic opportunity to achieve progress toward the establishment of such a zone in the Middle East region. Consequently, the international community should not look upon this initiative as if it were peripheral to the

(Mr. Karem, Egypt)

problem of the Middle East. This initiative should be dealt with on the basis of the fact that it aims first and foremost at ridding the region of the dangers of the nuclear arms race and at confidence building between all the Parties concerned in this respect.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 refers in its third operative paragraph to resolution GC(XXXVI)/Res/6012 which was adopted by consensus at the 36th General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency concerning the application of the Agency's safeguards in the Middle East. That resolution affirmed the urgent need for the States of the region to accept the full-scope safeguards on all their nuclear activities as an important measure towards building confidence between all the States in the region and as an important step towards strengthening international peace and security within the framework of establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East. The same resolution invites the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency to undertake consultations with all the States in the region in order to facilitate the immediate application of the safeguards to all their nuclear activities in the Middle East. This is an important development which must be noted.

Operative paragraph 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 requests the Secretary-General to pursue further consultations with the States of the region and other concerned States and to take into account the positive evolving situation in the region in order to move towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East.

(Mr. Karem, Egypt)

Moreover, in preambular paragraph 8 and operative paragraph 8, the draft resolution refers to the establishment of a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction in the region of the Middle East. This was the Egyptian initiative presented in April 1990 by President Mubarak, with the aim of dealing with all weapons of mass destruction and ridding the Middle East region of the threat of such weapons and establishing an appropriate verification system. Undoubtedly, the relationship between the two initiatives is clear, essential and important, since they both aim at achieving the objectives of comprehensive and complete disarmament, and ensuring peace and security in the region of the Middle East, by putting an end to the use or threat of use of weapons of mass destruction.

In conclusion, I should like to affirm that in preparing draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.11 for this session, our delegation made a point of maintaining its balanced formulation as well as the ideas, letter and spirit, that have gained full support and consensus within the General Assembly. In this respect, our delegation intensified the consultation with all the parties concerned, as well as with other interested parties, and we hope that our draft resolution will be adopted by the consensus as it has been attracting since 1980.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Germany, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2 and A/C.1/47/L.15.

Mr. VON WAGNER (Germany): Today I wish first to introduce, on behalf of all of its sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, entitled "Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction". The number of sponsors has risen to 143 so in order to save precious time I shall not read out all of the names but shall simply refer to document A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, which gives the

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

complete list. I should like to express my profound appreciation and gratitude for the support of so many delegations and Governments, whose co-sponsorship has made this draft resolution a very special one. In particular, I should like to thank the two traditional authors and sponsors of the draft resolution on chemical weapons in this Committee, Canada and Poland, which provided invaluable help in drafting and promoting the document. I should also like to thank all of the sponsors for the particularly constructive spirit in which they dealt with amendments to the first draft, thus greatly facilitating the elaboration of the two revisions.

There is hardly any need now to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2. Its main thrust is to promote the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction as adopted by the Conference on Disarmament. As for the Convention itself, I may draw the Committee's attention to the statement I made at the 4th meeting, on 13 October 1992, in which I gave a detailed presentation of the Convention and its main provisions.

Today, I should like only to emphasize once more the significance of the Convention for international peace and security. The essential points in this respect are spelt out in the seventh paragraph of the preamble to the draft resolution, which reads as follows:

> "Convinced that the Convention, particularly as adherence to it approaches universality, will contribute to the maintenance of international peace and improve the security of all States, and that it therefore merits the strong support of the entire international community".

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

This paragraph points to the importance of universality. Here, the extraordinarily high number of sponsors augurs well and should encourage even greater participation in the signing ceremony to be held in Paris on 13 January 1993. In saying this, I am aware of the fact that some delegations hold the opinion that there may be security issues that are not covered by this Convention and to which prior solutions are desirable. I am also aware that, in respect of matters of national security, States are bound to devise their own courses of action with particular circumspection.

Having said all this, I should like, nevertheless, to urge all delegations to weigh with the utmost care the benefits of joining and the costs of not joining the Convention. I am firmly convinced that all States, whatever the particular circumstances in their specific region, can only gain by making this truly historic endeavour a success - gain in terms of building confidence, increasing their security, and enhancing economic opportunity.

Let me conclude the introduction of this draft resolution by quoting once more from the revised draft resolution, which speaks of implementation of the Convention as a means of enhancing

> "cooperative multilateralism as a basis for international peace and security". (A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, para. 4)

We all subscribe to this concept, so let us put it to work and make the Convention a success story of truly global disarmament and arms control.

Secondly, I have the honour, on behalf of Brazil and Germany, of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields". This draft resolution is sponsored also by Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica,

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, the Russian Federation, Spain, Uruguay and Venezuela, as well as Germany.

Indeed, promising developments in the recent discussion about science and technology have made possible the submission, by Brazil and Germany, of a joint draft resolution on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

In essence, the draft resolution merges strands of thinking so far contained in two resolutions - the German resolution on science and technology for disarmament; and the Brazilian resolution on the transfer of high technology with military applications. The developments that made possible the merging of the two resolutions are most tangibly reflected in this year's report of the Disarmament Commission (A/47/42). With the Committee's indulgence, I shall therefore briefly recall the most pertinent language of that report. On the basis of the respective Brazilian and German resolutions, the draft resolution translates these formulations into operative terms.

On the sub-item "Science and technology for disarmament", the report states that progress was made in identifying areas in which disarmament-related science and technology is applied, including areas in relation to weapons disposal, military conversion and the negotiation and verification of disarmament agreements. The report goes on to quote from paragraph 6 of the report of Working Group IV on agenda item 7, as follows:

"Further, the need to strengthen international cooperation in this regard was recognized. During the course of discussions it also became clear

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

that the question of access to disarmament-related technologies required for the effective implementation of disarmament agreements was of particular relevance. It was generally agreed that efforts should be increased to develop concrete recommendations under this sub-item." (A/47/42, para. 31)

In the light of this encouraging convergence of views the draft resolution, in operative paragraph 1, would have the General Assembly call upon the Disarmament Commission to intensify its work on science and technology under its agenda item 7 and to submit substantive recommendations on this matter as soon as possible. In addition, in operative paragraph 3, the Assembly would invite Member States to undertake additional efforts to apply science and technology for disarmament-related purposes and to make such technologies available to interested States.

With regard to the deliberations on the sub-item concerning the transfer of high technology with military applications, the report registers the fact that the Working Group continued its consideration of the proposal by Argentina and Brazil

"for seeking universally acceptable guidelines that would regulate international transfers of sensitive technologies." (A/47/42, para. 31 (8))

The Working Group's report continues:

"In this context the need to widen multilateral dialogue was recognized. It was further agreed that norms or guidelines for the transfer of high technology with military applications should take into account the legitimate requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, while ensuring that they did not deny access to high technology products, services and know-how for peaceful purposes." (ibid.)

(Mr. von Wagner, Germany)

Hence, in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution the General Assembly would invite Member States to widen multilateral dialogue, bearing in mind the proposal for seeking universally acceptable international norms or guidelines that would regulate international transfers of sensitive technologies with military applications. Furthermore, in operative paragraph 2, the Assembly would request the Conference on Disarmament to pursue constructively - in response to resolution 46/36 L of 9 December 1991 - its work on the agenda item entitled "Transparency in armaments", which includes consideration of the elaboration of practical means to increase openness and transparency related to the transfer of high technology with military applications.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope of the delegations sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15 that their draft resolution on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields will command broad support. This year's report of the Disarmament Commission provides most promising conditions in this respect. Indeed, the delegations of Brazil and Germany feel that we could all pave the way for fruitful deliberations on science and technology at the forthcoming session of the Disarmament Commission by adopting draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15 without a vote.

Mr. FUJITA (Brazil): I should like to refer to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2 and draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15.

My comments on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15, which has just been introduced by the representative of Germany and of which my delegation has the honour to be one of the initiators, will be very brief.

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

We fully endorse the statement just made by Ambassador von Wagner, and here we wish simply to underscore the constructive and forward-looking approach that formed the basis of our joint effort. The convergence of interests reflected in the merging of the German and Brazilian draft resolutions this year fully attests to the importance of the theme of the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

The constructive dialogue between our delegations, which permitted the merging of our two past resolutions and the broad spectrum of sponsorship of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15 augur well for the widening of the multilateral dialogue on this item at the Disarmament Commission and for its successful conclusion next year. We invite all delegations to extend full support to draft resolution L.15 so as to allow its adoption without a vote.

Turning now to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev.2, my delegation, as one of its sponsors, wishes to take this opportunity to stress the importance the Brazilian Government attaches to the Convention on Chemical Weapons. The conclusion of the draft Convention by the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva on 3 September of this year represented the long awaited culmination of a 24-year negotiating process. We therefore have every reason to rejoice at the positive final result of that difficult process, whose fruit is now ready to be endorsed by our Governments.

In the view of the Brazilian delegation, the draft Convention is a remarkable achievement as it provides for the total banning of a particularly abhorrent kind of weapon. Besides, in Paris, early next year, the international community will have before it, open for signature, the first

(Mr. Fujita, Brazil)

multilateral agreement on disarmament and arms control of a truly global, broad, verifiable and non-discriminatory nature.

Of particular importance to us is the fact that due attention was given to the need to preserve and advance the legitimate rights of all States to development of their chemical industries for peaceful purposes, including through international exchanges. It is our earnest hope that the entry into force of the Convention will have a major confidence-building effect and will thus contribute to enhancing the legitimate process of international transfer of chemical technology for peaceful purposes.

In September 1991, together with Argentina and Chile, Brazil signed the Mendoza Declaration, an instrument that gives concrete shape to our unequivocal rejection of chemical and biological weapons and stresses our commitment to becoming original signatories of the Convention on Chemical Weapons. Later, the significance of the Mendoza Declaration was further enhanced by the joining of Uruguay, Paraguay, Bolivia and Ecuador.

To a large extent the Latin American and Caribbean region may be considered a pioneer in the universal quest for a safer world, which is contingent on the total banning of all kinds of weapons of mass destruction. The Treaty of Tlatelolco for the prohibition of nuclear weapons, whose full entry into force is now within reach, is a good example of such a vocation.

It is the Brazilian delegation's hope that the international community, with a spirit of common determination, will now proceed to ensure the quick entry into force of the Convention on Chemical Weapons.

The CHAIRMAN: I call upon the representative of Mexico, who will introduce draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.39 and L.41.

Mrs. GONZALEZ (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I should like at the outset to comment upon draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament", which the representative of Belgium has just introduced. I shall then introduce the two draft resolutions to which you, Mr. Chairman, have referred.

As we are all aware, in 1981 the Conference on Disarmament began to prepare a comprehensive programme for disarmament. following the General Assembly's Declaration of the 1980s as the Second Disarmament Decade. That Declaration stated that the Committee on Disarmament should expedite its work on the elaboration of the comprehensive programme of disarmament with a view to its adoption no later than at the second special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, scheduled for 1982. The issue of the preparation of a comprehensive programme of disarmament appeared on the Conference's agenda until 1989, when it was considered in an ad hoc committee.

The Final Document of the tenth special session, in 1978, stated that a comprehensive programme of disarmament should encompass

> "all measures thought to be advisable in order to ensure that the goal of general and complete disarmament under effective international control becomes a reality in a world in which international peace and security prevail and in which the new international economic order is strengthened and consolidated." (S-10/2, para. 109)

The Conference on Disarmament divided that programme into six chapters: "Introduction", "Objectives', "Principles", "Priorities", "Disarmament measures" and "Machinery and procedures". With the exception of chapter V, up until 1989 considerable progress was made in the preparation of that

(Mrs. Gonzalez, Mexico)

programme. Several sections had already been adopted by consensus. In the First Committee's deliberations, it was frequently stated that the current international climate was highly favourable for progress in disarmament, particularly nuclear disarmament. The various disarmament agreements and initiatives that have been undertaken in the last two years at the multilateral, bilateral and even unilateral levels could better be contemplated within a general framework encompassing all advisable measures in order to ensure multilateral negotiations that are orderly and agreed by all.

A comprehensive programme of disarmament under the auspices of the United Nations would strengthen the Organization's role in international peace and security. The delegation of Mexico is convinced that in the efforts currently being made to improve the structure and functioning of the Conference on Disarmament and to make it more flexible, one of our aims should be to utilize the 10-year negotiating period. We should direct ourselves towards the adjustment of all texts already agreed upon and the solving of all outstanding issues in the light of new realities and prospects.

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.28, just introduced by the Ambassador of Belgium, is the result of negotiations carried out by a broad group of delegations in recent weeks to ensure that a single draft resolution would come before the First Committee on the report of the Conference on Disarmament. It reiterates the function of the Conference on Disarmament as constituting the single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum, and it notes with satisfaction the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to fulfil this role in the light of the evolving international situation with a view to making early substantive progress on priority items of its agenda.

(Mrs. Gonzalez, Mexico)

My delegation will therefore no longer insist on separate consideration of its own draft resolution on the comprehensive programme of disarmament.

I turn now to the introduction of draft resolutions A/C.1/47/L.39, on the World Disarmament Campaign, and L.41, on a nuclear-arms freeze.

Because of the speed and intensity of change in the world, there is a need for balanced, objective information on the vast potential of the United Nations for the establishment of a system of international security based on respect for international law, mutual trust and cooperation between States for the solution of the major economic and social problems afflicting all countries.

The World Disarmament Campaign was launched by the General Assembly on 7 June 1982, on the proposal of Mexico. Its goal is the broadest possible dissemination of information and unimpeded access by all sectors of the public to a wide range of information and opinions on arms limitation and disarmament and on the danger inherent in all aspects of the arms race and war especially nuclear war. Since its inception the Campaign has focused on organizing conferences and regional meetings, running a wide-ranging publications programme and marking such events as Disarmament Week. This work has ensured that Government officials, the mass media, non-governmental organizations, teachers' groups, academic research institutions, elected officials and the public in general have the opportunity to familiarize themselves with, understand and support United Nations work in the field of disarmament.

On behalf of the delegations of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Bolivia, Costa Rica, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar, the

(Mrs. Gonzalez, Mexico)

Philippines, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Ukraine, Venezuela and Mexico, I have the honour to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.39, entitled "World Disarmament Campaign". Its text is very similar to that of last year's resolution 46/37 A, but it includes a new operative paragraph, paragraph 7, commending the Secretary-General for supporting the efforts of universities, other academic institutions and non-governmental organizations active in the educational field, in widening the world-wide availability of disarmament education, and inviting him to continue to support and cooperate, without cost to the regular budget of the United Nations, with educational institutions and non-governmental organizations engaged in such efforts.

By the new paragraph 4 the General Assembly would decide that the World Disarmament Campaign will be known hereafter as the "United Nations Disarmament Information Programme" and the World Disarmament Campaign Voluntary Trust Fund as the "Voluntary Trust Fund for the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme".

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.39 trust that the changes made this year will generate greater support by all States for the United Nations Disarmament Information Programme and for its Voluntary Trust Fund.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41.

The changes in the world political situation over the past three years have given us the opportunity to be firmer and more constructive in moulding a more civilized world society. The new international climate has permitted considerable progress in reducing the numbers of certain types of nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the miliary super-Powers. Most recently it

(Mrs. Gonzalez, Mexico)

led to the conclusion of an international Convention on the complete prohibition of chemical weapons. There is no doubt that these changes may mark the first stages in reversing the arms race and establishing a more stable, peaceful system of international security to govern international relations.

The debate at recent sessions of the General Assembly shows that all Members of the United Nations are gratified at the end of the cold war and East-West confrontation, which for nearly half a century threatened the outbreak of nuclear conflagration. But little or nothing is said about the policy of nuclear deterrence on which some States continue to base their national security. We believe that so long as the nuclear Powers refuse to give up those absurd doctrines, the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction will continue to be Utopian. In the short term, efforts to consolidate a true non-proliferation regime will continue to be stymied.

No one can deny that despite the adoption of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) nearly 25 years ago, and despite the considerable reductions in nuclear arsenals agreed upon by the two nuclear super-Powers, the nuclear-weapon States now possess about three times as many atomic weapons as they held in 1968, when the NPT was signed.

Mexico therefore thinks it vital to retain the priorities established by the United Nations in the field of disarmament. It is particularly important at this time of transition that we retain our goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, with a view to the achievement of general and complete

(Mrs. Gonzalez, Mexico)

disarmament under effective international control. Improvements in the international situation must enhance the status of that goal rather than diminishing it, at a time of rejoicing over the end of the bipolar confrontation.

It is now more than ever necessary to put an end to the development of new weapons, the improvement of existing ones and the production of further nuclear weapons and fissionable material for such weapons if we really want to make progress towards effective means of preventing the horizontal and vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons. In that context, I wish, on behalf of the delegations of Bolivia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, India, Indonesia, Myanmar and Mexico, to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.41, entitled "Nuclear-arms freeze".

The draft resolution is very similar to those of past years. There are some changes to the preambular part, to reflect agreements reached by nuclear Powers on reductions in certain types of nuclear weapons, and to welcome the moratoriums on nuclear-weapon tests currently observed by various nuclear Powers. In the operative part, the General Assembly would once again urge the Russian Federation and the United States of America to reach agreement on an immediate nuclear-arms freeze, which would, inter alia, provide for a simultaneous total stoppage of any production of nuclear weapons and fissionable material for weapons purposes.

(Mrs. Gonzalez, Mexico)

Also in the operative part of the draft resolution, an appeal is made to all nuclear-weapon States to agree, through a joint declaration, to a comprehensive nuclear-arms freeze, which would include a comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, the complete cessation of the manufacture of nuclear weapons and their delivery vehicles, a ban on all further deployment of nuclear weapons and of their delivery vehicles, and the complete cessation of the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes. That agreement would be subject to appropriate and effective measures and procedures of verification. While a nuclear-arms freeze is not an end in itself, such a measure would hinder the qualitative improvement of the present generation of nuclear weapons and the manufacture of more such weapons. The sponsors of resolution A/C.1/47/L.41 trust that it will enjoy the wide support of the States Members of the United Nations and be adopted in the Committee and in the General Assembly.

May I now make some very brief comments on draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18 on "Transparency in armaments". On 9 December 1991 the General Assembly adopted resolution 46/36 L, entitled "Transparency in armaments". Under that resolution an international Register of Conventional Arms was established, and Member States of the United Nations must provide the Secretary-General with information on their arms exports, together with data on their military holdings, procurement through national production and relevant political policies. The same resolution - 46/36 L - called upon the Secretary-General, with the assistance of a panel of governmental technical experts, to elaborate the technical procedures and make any adjustments to the annex to the resolution necessary for the effective operation of the Register, and to

(Mrs. Gonzalez, Mexico)

prepare a report on the modalities for early expansion of the scope of the Register by the addition of further categories of equipment and inclusion of data on military holdings and procurement through natiional production.

The group of experts held three sessions in the first half of 1992 and was able to discharge the mandate of the Secretary-General, adopting unanimously the report that had been requested, which is contained in document A/47/342.

Although the Mexican expert joined in the adoption of the report, we believe that there must be enough information so that in this phase of the Register the information should be in greater detail, with a view to ensuring that the exercise is a real tool for confidence-building and transparency. This has proved impossible to achieve in the face of opposition from some experts from weapon-producing countries who considered that provision of detailed information would endanger the national security of their States. It was also not possible to make sufficient adjustments to the annex to the resolution even though operative paragraph 8 of the resolution clearly states that necessary adjustments might be made to ensure the effective operation of the Register. Once again, the group of experts were unable properly to discharge this mandate in the face of the refusal by certain of the experts who said that any significant changes to the annex would imply an expansion in the scope of the Register, and that the matter should be considered by the group of experts to be set up in 1994.

Finally, it must be stated that we regret that one fundamental matter, the modalities for the early expansion of the scope of the Register should have been reflected in the report of the panel of experts as a mere account

(Mrs. Gonzalez, Mexico)

of the possibilities and a list of matters raised during the sessions of the panel, without providing any conclusion that could be of use as a basis for the future work of the group of experts to be set up in 1994.

We think efforts should be increased in order to ensure that in the near future we can expand the scope of the international Register of Conventional Arms, so that it may become a true tool for confidence-building and security among States, as well as a significant step forward in promoting transparency on military matters.

The CHAIRMAN: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform the Committee that a number of delegations have requested that the deadline for submission of draft resolutions under international security agenda items - that is, items 67 and 69 - be extended to Thursday, 12 November 1992, at 6 p.m. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that this proposal is acceptable to the Committee.

It was so decided.

The CHAIRMAN: I urge those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions under those two agenda items to submit them to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.1/Rev. 2: Burundi;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.5: Japan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.12: Japan;

(Mr. Kheradi)

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.15: Bolivia, Ecuador, Finland, Italy, Uruguay and Venezuela;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18: Lesotho;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.22: Burundi and Ethiopia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.24: Dominica, Ethiopia and Kazakhstan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.25: Burundi;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.34: Denmark;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.35: Burundi; and

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.37: Netherlands.

The CHAIRMAN: The next meeting of the Committee will take place tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. This will be the special meeting devoted to the consideration of the Secretary-General's report "New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post-Cold-War Era".

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.